## REMARKS

Required summary of interview (April 20, 2006): The claims and their interpretation were discussed.

The Examiner's Office Action dated March 17, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, claims 1-19 have been canceled without waiver or prejudice. Claims 20, 27, 29, and 30 have amended to claim the invention more specifically. Claim 37 is added to further protect the invention. Claims 20 and 37 are independent claims. Claims 20-37 are now pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's recommendation for possible allowance in "Possible Reasons for Allowance" section of the Office Action. The Office Action sets forth that "using the input parameters from the IDE, AGP and PCI to help train a neural network for making changes in the clock multiplier factor which affects the CPU frequency" is allowable.

According to the Examiner's recommendation, Claim 20 has been amended on the basis of features recited in claims 27, 29, and 30. Claims 27, 29, and 30 are further amended editorially for clarity. Support for the amendment can be found in at least paragraphs 0030 and 0031 of the originally filed specification. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that claim 20, as amended, is now in condition for allowance.

The Office Action has made the following rejections of claims 1-36 over several cited references from different aspects.

- 8 -

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdravkovic in view of Sager.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdravkovic in view of Sager, and further in view of Feng.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdravkovic in view of Sager, and further in view of Lin.

Claims 5, 6, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Zdravkovic and Sager, and further in view of Hewlett.

Claims 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdravkovic in view of Sager, and further in view of Feng.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Zdravkovic, Sager and Feng, and further in view of Lin.

Claims 16, 17, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Zdravkovic, Sager and Feng, and further in view of Hewlett.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feng in view of Zdravkovic and further in view of Sager.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Feng, Zdravkovic and Sager, and further in view of Asghar.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Feng, Zdravkovic and Sager, and further in view of Lin.

-9-

Finally, claims 27-30 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Feng, Zdravkovic and Sager, and further in view of Hewlett.

It is respectfully submitted that since claims 1-19 have been canceled, the above rejections regarding claims 1-19 are rendered moot.

Regarding claims 20-36, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 has been amended to be in the condition for allowance. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21-36 depending from claim 20 are also allowable, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

To further protect the invention, claim 37 is added as an independent claim based on claim 36, with support from at least paragraphs 0030 and 0031 of the originally filed specification. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references in record do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features set forth in claim 37 as the following:

"(i) executing a learning procedure, step (i) comprising:

providing p dummy environmental parameters including dummy environmental parameters with respect to data access of a storage drive controller of the computer system, a graphical display interface of the computer system, and a peripheral component interface of the computer system;

providing a dummy output vector; and

calculating m basis weights by the neural network according to the p dummy environmental parameters and the dummy output vector".

- 10 -

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 37 patently defines over the prior art references.

## Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application with claims 20-37 is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance and passing of the application to issue, are earnestly requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

May 17, 2006
Date

*Nick Bromer*

Nick Bromer  (Reg. No. 33,478)
**(717) 426-1664**
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax  : (202) 408-0924

*I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 571-273-8300) on May 17, 2006.*

*Nick Bromer [reg. no. 33,478]*        *Signature*  *Nick Bromer*

- 11 -